The appearance of these minutes from here on is due to an inadvertent loss of the original copies.

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C., FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1941.

The sixth meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1941 was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on Friday, February 28. The following members were present:

Mr. Clarke, Chairman,
Mr. Lamb,
Mr. Manship,
Mr. Holabird,
Dr. Cret,
H. P. Caemmerer,

also Secretary and Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a. m.

1. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: The Minutes of the meeting held January 23, 1941, were approved.

2. PROMOTION OF THE SECRETARY: The Chairman brought to the attention of the Commission the question of a promotion for the secretary from C. A. F. 10 to C. A. F. 12. The Chairman stated that a promotion after ten years of service is warranted and also in view of the increase in the duties of the position since 1930. The Commission concurred in the matter.

3. THIRTEENTH REPORT OF THE COMMISSION: The Secretary brought to the attention of the Commission a copy of the Thirteenth Report of the Commission of Fine Arts for the period January 1, 1935--December 31, 1939. It consists of 159 pages and about 100 illustrations. It is printed as House Document No. 648 and has been made available to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, for 50 cents a copy. The Commission were pleased to see the Report.

4. MARQUEE FOR UNION STATION: The secretary presented Application No. 889, dated February 24, 1941, submitted by the Inspector of Buildings of the

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C., FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1941.

The sixth meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year
41 was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on Friday,
bruary 28. The following members were present:

Mr. Clarke, Chairman,
Mr. Lamb,
Mr. Mansfip,
Mr. Holabird,
Dr. Oret,
H. P. Caemmerer,

so

Secretary and Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a. m.

1. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: The Minutes of the meeting held January
, 1941, were approved.

2. PROMOTION OF THE SECRETARY: The Chairman brought to the attention of
e Commission the question of a promotion for the secretary from C. A. P. 10
C. A. P. 12. The Chairman stated that a promotion after ten years of
rvice is warranted and also in view of the increase in the duties of the
sition since 1930. The Commission concurred in the matter.

3. THIRTEENTH REPORT OF THE COMMISSION: The Secretary brought to the
tention of the Commission a copy of the Thirteenth Report of the Commission
Fine Arts for the period January 1, 1935--December 31, 1939. It contains
[illegible] pages and about 100 illustrations. It is printed as House Document
. 69, and has been made available to the public by the Superintendent of
ocuments, Government Printing Office, for 50 cents a copy. The Commission
re pleased to see the Report.

4. MARQUEE FOR UNION STATION: The secretary presented Application No. 889,
ted February 24, 1941, submitted by the Inspector of Buildings of the

District of Columbia, indicating a design for a marquee in front of Union Station, and a letter from the manager of the Washington Terminal Company, as follows:

February 18th, 1941.

Board of Commissioners,
District of Columbia,
Washington, D. C.

Sirs:

On behalf of The Washington Terminal Company I am making formal application for a permit to erect a marquee at the Main entrance to the Union Station as indicated on plan "G" dated January 27th, 1940, which is enclosed herewith. In support of this application, I call attention to the fact that vehicular traffic has developed to such a large extent within recent years that, that part of the space at the West end of Union Station which is set aside for vehicular traffic and is under cover, protecting patrons from bad weather, is entirely insufficient to meet demands. In order to relieve the congested condition at this point, vehicular traffic has been handled via the roadway in front of Union Station, at which location, as you know, street cars and buses are also operated. For the orderly handling of all automobiles moving over this area, distinct traffic lanes have been established and between them, platforms erected. This arrangement as such has contributed very materially to freer and more efficient handling of vehicular traffic to and from Union Station.

While these benefits have come about, patrons making use of the roadway fronting the main entrance to the Union Station are in nowise protected against the elements, a condition which, in our judgment, should not exist. The proposed marquee will remedy this condition and it is our belief that this much needed benefit to the public can be provided without detrimental effect to the general architectural scheme of the surroundings.

I shall be pleased if you will take the matter under consideration and see your way clear to give early approval to our application.

Yours very truly,
(Signed) B. R. Tolson,
Manager.

The Commission inspected the design and recalled that it was similar to one presented at a meeting held February 24, 1940, when that design was disapproved. Similarly the Commission disapproved this design. The Commission

District of Columbia, indicating a design for a marquee in front of Union

Station, and a letter from the manager of the Washington Terminal Company, as

follows:

February 18th, 1941.

Board of Commissioners,
District of Columbia,
Washington, D. C.

Sirs:

On behalf of The Washington Terminal Company I am making formal application for a permit to erect a marquee at the Main entrance to the Union Station as indicated on plan "C" dated January 27th, 1940, which is enclosed herewith. In support of this application, I call attention to the fact that vehicular traffic has developed to such a large extent within recent years that, that part of the space at the West end of Union Station which is set aside for vehicular traffic and is under cover, protecting patrons from bad weather, is entirely insufficient to meet demands. In order to relieve the congested condition at this point, vehicular traffic has been handled via the roadway in front of Union Station, at which location, as you know, street cars and buses are also operated. For the orderly handling of all automobiles moving over this area, distinct traffic lanes have been established and between them, platforms erected. This arrangement as such has contributed very materially to freer and more efficient handling of vehicular traffic to and from Union Station.

While these benefits have come about, patrons making use of the roadway fronting the main entrance to the Union Station are in nowise protected against the elements, a condition which, in our judgment, should not exist. The proposed marquee will remedy this condition and it is our belief that this much needed benefit to the public can be provided without detrimental effect to the general architectural scheme of the surroundings.

I shall be pleased if you will take the matter under consideration and see your way clear to give early approval to our application.

Yours very truly,
(Signed) B. R. Tolson,
Manager.

The Commission inspected the design and recalled that it was similar to

one presented at a meeting held February 24, 1940, when that design was dis-

approved. Similarly the Commission disapproved this design. The Commission

felt that it would be detrimental to the appearance of Union Station to allow the proposed structure to be erected in front of the building since it would cut off the columns visually. Mr. Lamb said the problem is difficult of solution aesthetically. Mr. Clarke suggested that the solution is to build a drive below the grade with the necessary overpass ramps, etc., which would not interfere with the normal traffic at grade and still permit of protection from the weather.

The Commission recognized the desirability of giving protection to patrons of Union Station and therefore recommended that the Washington Terminal Company employ an architect to study the situation and prepare a plan to be submitted for consultation with the Commission. Mr. Tolson was informed accordingly (Exhibit A)

5. SEAL FOR THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS: The Chairman expressed the desirability of having a seal for the Commission of Fine Arts. He said it would be useful for important documents of the Commission or could be used on the letterhead in the same manner as the shield of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission is being used. The secretary presented an insignia in medallion form that had been designed by Mr. Partridge and had been used in connection with exhibitions. However, the Commission felt that that design was too complicated. Mr. Manship was requested to study the sketch and submit a design for a seal at a future meeting of the Commission.

6. PAINTINGS FOR THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING: Under date of February 24, 1941, the following letter was received from Mr. Edward B. Rowan:

felt that it would be detrimental to the appearance of Union Station to allow the proposed structure to be erected in front of the building since it would cut off the columns visually. Mr. Lamb said the problem is difficult of solution aesthetically. Mr. Clarke suggested that the solution is to build a drive below the grade with the necessary overpass ramps, etc., which would not interfere with the normal traffic at grade and still permit of protection from the weather.

The Commission recognized the desirability of giving protection to patrons of Union Station and therefore recommended that the Washington Terminal Company employ an architect to study the situation and prepare a plan to be submitted for consultation with the Commission. Mr. Tolson was informed accordingly (Exhibit A)

5. SEAL FOR THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS: The Chairman expressed the desirability of having a seal for the Commission of Fine Arts. He said it would be useful for important documents of the Commission or could be used on the letterhead in the same manner as the shield of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission is being used. The secretary presented an insignia in medallion form that had been designed by Mr. Partridge and had been used in connection with exhibitions. However, the Commission felt that that design was too complicated. Mr. Manship was requested to study the sketch and submit a design for a seal at a future meeting of the Commission.

6. PAINTINGS FOR THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING: Under date of February 24, 1941, the following letter was received from Mr. Edward B. Rowan:

February 24, 1941.

Dear Mr. Clarke:

Reference is made to four preliminary designs for the proposed mural decoration of the new Department of the Interior Building. These are by Millard Sheets and deal with the cultural contribution of the Negro race.

In the four panels Mr. Sheets deals with the subjects of Education, Science, the Arts and Religion. After preliminary conferences with a committee of distinguished colored citizens appointed by the Secretary of the Interior it was felt that no actual portraits should be used and that the Arts and Religion panels were too similar. It is understood that a number of changes will be made as the work progresses.

The comments and advice of the Commission of Fine Arts will be greatly appreciated on these preliminary designs. If the Commission wishes, this office will be pleased to forward photographs of the full size cartoons when they have been prepared for their further comment.

Thanking you, I am

Very cordially yours,
(Signed) Edward B. Rowan,
Assistant Chief,
Section of Fine Arts.

The Commission inspected the paintings. The secretary reported that it is proposed to place these mural paintings on the east and west sides of the stairway from the first floor to the second of the new Interior Department Building.

The Commission were not particularly impressed with the color scheme of the design, stating, however, that Millard Sheets is "a very able painter and a good water-colorist". The Commission requested the secretary to write to Mr. Savage and ask him to inspect the design and submit a report to the Commission.

7. PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT: The secretary presented the following received from Mr. T. S. Settle, Secretary of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission:

February 24, 1941.

Dear Mr. Clarke:

Reference is made to four preliminary designs for the proposed mural decoration of the new Department of the Interior Building. These are by Millard Sheets and deal with the cultural contribution of the Negro race.

In the four panels Mr. Sheets deals with the subjects of Education, Science, the Arts and Religion. After preliminary conferences with a committee of distinguished colored citizens appointed by the Secretary of the Interior it was felt that no actual portraits should be used and that the Arts and Religion panels were too similar. It is understood that a number of changes will be made as the work progresses.

The comments and advice of the Commission of Fine Arts will be greatly appreciated on these preliminary designs. If the Commission wishes, this office will be pleased to forward photographs of the full size cartoons when they have been prepared for their further comment.

Thanking you, I am

Very cordially yours,

(Signed) Edward B. Rowan,
Assistant Chief,
Section of Fine Arts.

The Commission inspected the paintings. The secretary reported that it is proposed to place these mural paintings on the east and west sides of the stairway from the first floor to the second of the new Interior Department Building.

The Commission were not particularly impressed with the color scheme of the design, stating, however, that Millard Sheets is "a very able painter and a good water-colorist". The Commission requested the secretary to write to Mr. Savage and ask him to inspect the design and submit a report to the Commission.

7. PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT: The secretary presented the following received from Mr. T. S. Settle, Secretary of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission:

February 14, 1941.

Mr. H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary
Fine Arts Commission
7000 New Interior Building,
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. Caemmerer:

During the last several meetings of the Commission there has been discussion of extending the Shipstead Act so as to protect monumental public buildings, cathedrals, colleges, etc.

At the direction of the Chairman, I re-wrote the Shipstead-Act so as to include these various buildings. Attached is a copy of the original draft with the additions underscored.

The Commission is of the opinion that the term, "any public or private school building, "covers too much territory and indeed, the buildings to be included in the amended bill will have to be limited.

Your advice on this matter is respectfully requested.

Yours very truly,
T. S. Settle,
Secretary.

Mr. Settle proposed adding the following amendment to the Shipstead-Luce Act:

After the word White House insert: the grounds of any other public building, of any public or private school building, of any college or university, or of any church or cathedral.

The secretary reported that he had a talk with Mr. Settle concerning this matter and had stated that in his opinion the above amendment was too broad, and further that certain large park areas, not now mentioned in the Act, should be included. The secretary suggested the following amendment:

After the word White House insert: the grounds of any other major public building, and public or private school building, of any college or university, cathedral or similar church building of major importance,

February 14, 1941.

Mr. H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary
Fine Arts Commission
7000 New Interior Building,
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. Caemmerer:

During the last several meetings of the Commission there has been discussion of extending the Shipstead Act so as to protect monumental public buildings, cathedrals, colleges, etc.

At the direction of the Chairman, I re-wrote the Shipstead-Act so as to include these various buildings. Attached is a copy of the original draft with the additions underscored.

The Commission is of the opinion that the term, "any public or private school building," covers too much territory and indeed, the buildings to be included in the amended bill will have to be limited.

Your advice on this matter is respectfully requested.

Yours very truly,
T. S. Settle,
Secretary.

Mr. Settle proposed adding the following amendment to the Shipstead-Luce

ct:

After the word White House insert: the grounds of any other public building, of any public or private school building, of any college or university, or of any church or cathedral.

The secretary reported that he had a talk with Mr. Settle concerning this atter and had stated that in his opinion the above amendment was too broad, and rther that certain large park areas, not now mentioned in the Act, should be cluded. The secretary suggested the following amendment:

After the word White House insert: the grounds of any other major public building, and public or private school building, of any college or university, cathedral or similar church building of major importance,

Dupont Circle, Scott Circle, Thomas Circle, Meridian Hill Park, Franklin Square.

The secretary said he and Mr. Settle agreed to bring the matter to the attention of their respective Commissions at the next meeting.

Mr. Clarke said: The National Capital Park and Planning Commission by law is authorized to initiate any amendments that should be made to the Act while the Commission of Fine Arts carries them out. Apparently they have been annoyed by a number of things---hot dog stands on Connecticut Avenue opposite the Church of the Covenant, and by the Longfellow Building. All these things are creeping up here and there in the city and they think that there should be an amendment to the law which would give it very much wider power. I wonder if it would not be a good idea to have Mr. Settle come in and let him discuss it with us.

The proposed amendments as above stated were read. The Commission felt it would be difficult to determine what are "major buildings". The secretary reported that there are in the District of Columbia fully 400 church buildings, 200 public schools and about 100 private educational institutions.

Thereupon Mr. Settle attended the meeting and said, "So far the original Shipstead-Luce Act has been amended to include Lafayette Square. Last summer Mr. Delano and many others were much outraged at the erection of the Longfellow Building and the people of Saint Matthews Church and the Presbyterian Church nearby wrote to me and talked to me about the matter and said we must not let a thing like that happen in the future. We made two or three suggestions including one to prevail upon the R. F. C. not to finance a building until the plans are approved by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts." Mr. Clarke remarked, "The Longfellow

Dupont Circle, Scott Circle, Thomas Circle, Logan Hill park,

Franklin Square.

The secretary said he and Mr. Bettie agreed to bring the matter to the attention of their respective Commissions at the next meeting.

Mr. Sherrod said: The National Capital Park and Planning Commission by law is authorized to initiate any amendments that should be made to the act while the Commission of Fine Arts carries them out. Apparently they have been annoyed by a number of things---but may accept Commissioner Kramer opposite the Church of the Covenant, and by the Northern Building. All these things are creeping up here and there in the city and they think that there should be an amendment to the law which would give it very much wider power. I wonder if it would not be a good idea to have Mr. Bettie come in and let him discuss it with us.

The proposed amendments as above stated were read. The Commission felt it would be difficult to determine what are "major buildings". The secretary reported that there are in the District of Columbia fully 400 church buildings, 200 public schools and about 100 private educational institutions.

Thereupon Mr. Bettie attended the meeting and said, "So far the original Shipstead-Luce Act has been expanded to include Lafayette Square. Last summer Mr. Delano and many others were much outraged at the erection of the Longfellow building and the people of Saint Matthews Church and the Presbyterian Church nearby wrote to me and talked to me about the matter and said we must not let a thing like that happen in the future. We made two or three suggestions including one to prevail upon the U. S. not to finance a building until the plans are approved by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts." Mr. Delano remarked, "The Longfellow

Building was approved by the R. F. C. about a week before the Hon. Jesse Jones got my letter suggesting that the Commission of Fine Arts approve buildings erected in Washington in whole or in part with R. F. C. Funds. Mr. Jones agreed to submit plans for all such structures in the future."

Continuing, Mr. Settle said, "The other suggestion that we made was to revise our zoning map and regulations. We urged the inclusion of a measure into the Zoning Law that would meet situations of this sort. Then we suggested that for the protection of churches like the Catholic cathedral that the Shipstead-Luce Act might be amended. We brought it up at our December meeting, and it was held over until our January meeting, which was attended by Senator Shipstead and a committee representing citizens. Mr. Nichols from Kansas City, the realtor of our Commission, felt it was pretty far reaching because it might cause a lot of hardships. Now this bill that you have is pretty far reaching. Mr. Delano suggested an amendment that would protect cathedrals, churches, schools, but wants us to give some further study to the matter." Mr. Settle mentioned George Washington and American Universities and asked if we are going to protect these and similar institutions. Also he said, "Dean Powell of the Episcopal Cathedral is very public spirited and would like the Cathedral grounds protected. Any way that we can get that protection constitutionally and still protect some of these important buildings, so that it will not be a burden to you or to the public, we will be delighted to have it."

The Chairman then asked for the views of the other members of the Commission. He said, "One of the things that I have tried to guard against is the over-expansion of the Shipstead-Luce Act to the point where, if we got into the courts, they might throw the whole thing out. Then we might lose what we have. Personally I could see a gradual expansion to include areas around Government property. I cannot see how you can arbitrarily extend the Shipstead-Luce Act to protect private property or go around semi-public

the Whitestead-Dice Act to protect private property or to extend semi-public areas around Government property. I cannot see how you can arbitrarily extend those what we have. Personally I could see a gradual expansion to include ~~be~~ got into the courts, they might throw the whole thing out. Then we might is the over-expansion of the Whitestead-Dice Act to the point where, if Commission. He said, "One of the things that I have tried to guard against a burden to you or to the public, we will be delighted to have it."

The Chairman then asked for the views of the other members of the and still protect some of these important buildings, so that it will not be ~~preserve~~ protected. Any way that we can get that protection constitutionally of the Episcopal Cathedral is very public spirited and would like the Cathedral going to protect these and similar institutions. Also he said, "Dean Powell mentioned George Washington and American Universities and asked if we are schools, but wants us to give some further study to the matter." Mr. Bottle ir. Delano suggested an amendment that would protect cathedrals, churches, come a lot of murderers. Now this bill that you have is pretty far reaching. the position of our Commission, felt it was pretty far reaching because it might ~~mul~~tiplexed and a committee representation citizens. Mr. Nichols from Kansas City, and it was held over until our January meeting, which was attended by Senator Whitestead-Dice Act might be amended. We brought it up at our December meeting, that for the protection of churches like the Catholic cathedral west the into the zoning law that would meet situation of this sort. Then we suggested revise our zoning map and regulations. He urged the inclusion of a memorandum

Continuing, Mr. Bottle said, "The other suggestion that we made was to agreed to permit plans for all such structures in the future."

erected in Washington is wholly or in part with U. S. funds. Mr. Jones got an letter suggesting that the Commission of fine Arts approve buildings

buildings like a church, which does not belong to the Government. So long as we are guarding Government owned property we are going to be on fairly safe ground. The court , at least for the moment, are not ready for a further step. Then that means ultimately that we had better arrange to have the Shipstead-Luce Act cover the whole of the District of Columbia. I do not think the courts are ready to say we can control land around privately owned property, but if you want to protect Dupont Circle, Scott Circle, or Lincoln Square for a block back that would be all right. But we should not bite off too many things at one time. My own judgment is that there could be a reasonable extension of the Act. So far as friends of the Catholic Church are concerned, if they had a valuable piece of property they should not have let private land come right up to the Cathedral as they did. That is their problem. I do not know how the other members feel about it.

Mr. Lamb said, "I think things of that sort should be protected but you should be on solid ground. I think you are on solid ground when you limit the Shipstead Act to Federal property".

The secretary stated that he was present when the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia approved the bill in 1930. "At that time considerable discussion took place concerning Lafayette Square. It was stated that Lafayette Square should be included, but owners of private property adjacent to the Square objected to that at the time."

Mr. Settle said, "We did not want to do anything that would make the Act unconstitutional. We have a specific problem put up to us that we have got to meet in some way. The whole thing is difficult because of these

good buildings down in the business area, such as the Church of the Epiphany near Fourteenth and G Streets.

Mr. Clarke said, "When you start a discussion of that subject you can get as many people to differ concerning what is good taste. There are many people who would prefer the Longfellow Building to the Church of the Epiphany, or Saint Matthews Church. Tastes have changed materially in the last ten years. We are a lot more liberal than we were then so it is a difficult matter. I do not think it is in the province of the Fine Arts Commission to go about and ask for the protection of private buildings in the city.

Mr. Holabird said, "Why should we protect a bad church? If we were protecting a historical monument, an old colonial house, why then let us protect it and keep ugly things away from it."

Mr. Clarke replied, "I don't think the Church of the Covenant is a good piece of architecture. Some of the churches in Washington are terrible and why should we protect them? We are safe when we say that we aim to protect Government property. But to protect simply private or quasi-public buildings is not good. It comes into conflict with the Fourteenth Amendment, and the Police Powers as interpreted by the courts. Hon. Jesse Jones has written that the R. F. C. would not finance any more buildings of that sort without first getting approval of the design by the Commission of Fine Arts.

Dr. Cret said, "Too much aesthetic regulation is a mistake." Mr. Manship said, "So long as you have lots of private property you must maintain private rights

The Chairman then, in behalf of the Commission, suggested to Mr. Settle that he inform his Commission that the Commission of Fine Arts does not object to a reasonable expansion of the Shipstead-Luce Act, that protecting property opposite government property is sound; but otherwise to protect a church, etc., with no government property adjacent may be considered unconstitutional.

with no government property whatever may be considered unconstitutional.'

opposite government property is sound; but otherwise to protect a church, etc.' a reasonable expansion of the Hepburn-Iron Act, that protecting property be inferred his Commission that the Commission of Fine Arts does not object to

The Chairman then, in behalf of the Commission, suggested to Mr. Bestis that said, "So long as you have lots of private property you must maintain private rights."

Mr. Greet said, "Too much aesthetic regimentation is a mistake." Mr. Bestis without first getting approval of the design by the Commission of Fine Arts. Mr. Greet has written that the N. Y. C. would not finance any more buildings of that sort and the Police Powers as interpreted by the courts. Hon. Jesse Jones building is not good. It comes into conflict with the Fourteenth Amendment, protect Government property. But to protect simply private or quasi-public and why should we protect them? We are sure when we say that we aim to good piece of architecture. Some of the churches in Washington are terrible

Mr. Clarke replied, "I don't think the Church of the Covenant is a protecting a historical monument, an old colonial house, why then not re protect it and keep ugly things away from it."

Mr. Nolting said, "May should we protect a bad church? If we were to shout and say for the protection of private buildings in the city, matter. I do not think it is in the province of the Fine Arts Commission to Years. We are a lot more liberal than we were then so it is a difficult or Saint Matthews Church. Parties have changed materially in the last ten people who would prefer the Longfellow building to the church of the Trinity, get as many people to differ concerning what is good taste. There are many

Mr. Clarke said, "When you start a discussion of that sort you can

good buildings down in the business area, such as the Bureau of the Mint,

8. APARTMENT BUILDING, Q STREET AND THE ROCK CREEK PARKWAY: Several weeks ago Mr. Francis L. Koenig submitted a design for an apartment building between P and Q Streets adjacent to the Rock Creek Parkway. The secretary said that he had sent a set of prints to each of the architect members of the Commission. Dr. Cret criticized the plans and his criticisms were sent to Mr. Koenig by letter, as follows:

"Without questioning the general planning and general arrangement which are not the concern of the Commission, I have the impression that the fine opportunity given by the site has not been used very skilfully.

In regard to elevations:

P Street--Arrangement of garden and entrances to garage are very mediocre. The elevations are restless due to the putting together of every known system of fenestration: horizontal, vertical, curved bay windows, etc. The pent house is unsatisfactory and a simpler rectangular outline would be preferable.

Q Street-- The central feature parallel to the street is more satisfactory, but the 45 degree wing starting from it is again a medley of all kinds of fenestration.

Parkway-- The facade on this side is very mediocre, too broken up and factory-like.

In regard to the selection of materials, I agree that a salmon-colored red brick would be more desirable than the yellow brick. The design is, however, the primary concern in this case.

Mr. Koenig submitted a revised design, which was inspected. Dr.Cret thought the design "less ugly". Mr. Lamb and Mr. Holabird felt it would improve the design to eliminate the verticals from the main facade of the building. Mr.Koenig submitted samples of rose red brick, which the Commission considered to be satisfactory.

The Chairman designated Mr. Lamb to talk with Mr. Koenig to see how defects in the design might be remedied and suggested that Mr. Koenig submit a revised design for the next meeting of the Commission. Mr. Lamb reported that he had had a talk with Mr. Koenig, who said he would do this.

8. [illegible] Dunlap, [illegible] Local Chamber: [illegible] meeting
[illegible] Mr. Francis T. Dunlap submitted a design for an apartment building between
4 and 5 streets adjacent to the Park Avenue Subway. The secretary will [illegible]
had sent a set of prints to each of the architect members of the Commission.

Mr. Ouet criticised the plan and his criticisms were sent to Mr. Dunlap by
letter, as follows:

"Without considering the general planning and general
arrangement which are not the concern of the Commission, I have
the impression that the time opportunity given by the site has not
been used very skilfully.
In regard to elevations:

Street—Avenue sheet or Park Side and entrance to garage are
very mediocre. The elevations are meagre due to the putting
together of every known system of fenestration: horizontal,
vertical, curved bay windows, etc. The best model is unsatisfactory
and a simpler rectangular article would be preferable.

Street—The central feature parallel to the street is more
satisfactory, but the 45 degree wing starting from it is again a
medley of all kinds of fenestration.

Passage—The facade on this side is very mediocre, too broken
up and factory-like.

In regard to the selection of material, I agree that a salmon-
colored red brick would be more pleasing than the yellow brick.
The design is, however, the ordinary concern in this case.

Mr. Dunlap submitted a revised design, which was discussed. Mr. Ouet thought
the design "less ugly". Mr. Dunlap and Mr. Hopkins felt it would improve the
design to eliminate the verticals from the main facade of the building. Mr. Dunlap
submitted samples of rose red brick, which the Commission considered to be
satisfactory.

The Chairman designated Mr. Lamb to talk with Mr. Dunlap to see how
defects in the design might be remedied and suggested that Mr. Dunlap submit
a revised design for the next meeting of the Commission. Mr. Lamb reported
that he had had a talk with Mr. Dunlap, who said he would do this.

9. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE BUILDING: Mr. Louis Simon, Supervising Architect, in company with Mr. Dewey Foster, submitted a revised perspective drawing and block model for the General Accounting Office Building to be erected in the block bounded by Fourth and G and H Streets, N.W. (Except the area owned by St. Mary's Church along Fifth Street). The Commission inspected the design. The architect members of the Commission felt further study should be given to the main entrance of the building and the garage entrances. The Commission felt that the G Street facade still had a rather colonnaded appearance but Mr. Simon pointed out that there would be a considerable setback of the upper stories from the colonnade. The question of material for the building was discussed. Limestone was suggested but Mr. Simon said he proposed using brick with limestone trim. The Commission,after consideration,approved the design with the recommendation that further study be given to the main entrance and to the garage entrances and that they would like to have Mr. Simon submit a sample of the brick to be used. (Exhibit B)

The building will contain 550,000 square feet of floor space and house about 6,000 employes. It will cost in the neighborhood of $9,850,000.

10. COAL RECEIVING BUILDING: Mr. Simon submitted a design for a coal receiving building to be erected in connection with the West Central Heating Plant. The design was inspected by the architect members of the Commission and approved. (Exhibit C)

11. PLANTING PLAN FOR THE THOMAS JEFFERSON MEMORIAL: The National Park Service through Mr. Irving C. Root, Superintendent of National Capital Parks, and Mr. F. F. Gillen, Senior Assistant Superintendent, submitted a planting plan for the Thomas Jefferson Memorial. Mr. Frederick Law Olmsted, landscape architect, prepared the design, which was presented by Mr.H.V.Hubbard,

9. [illegible]: Mr. Louis [illegible], [illegible]
Arentsen, in [illegible] Mr. Larry [illegible], submitted a revised perspective
drawing and block model for the General Accounting Office building to be erected
in the block bounded by Fourth and G and H Streets, N.W. (Except the area
owned by St. Mary's Church along Fifth Street). The Commission instructed the
Staff. The architect members of the Commission felt further study should be
given to the main entrance of the building and the paving entrances. The
Commission felt that the G Street facade still had a rather colonnaded appear-
ance but Mr. Simon pointed out that there would be a considerable setback of the
upper stories from the colonnade. The question of material for the building
was discussed. Limestone was suggested but Mr. Simon said he proposed
using brick with limestone trim. The Commission, after consideration, approved
the design with the recommendation that further study be given to the main
entrance and to the paving entrances and that they would like to have
Mr. Simon submit a sample of the brick to be used. (Exhibit B)

The building will contain 980,000 square feet of floor space and house
about 6,000 employes. It will cost in the neighborhood of $3,850,000.

10. COAST GUARD BUILDING: Mr. Simon submitted a design for a coal
receiving building to be erected in connection with the Coast Guard Heating
Plant. The design was inspected by the architect members of the Commission
and approved. (Exhibit C)

11. PROPOSED IDEA FOR THE [illegible]: The Regional
Park Service through Mr. Irving W. Root, Superintendent of National Capital
Parks, and Mr. P. T. Eidem, Senior Assistant Superintendent, submitted a
planting plan for the Thomas Jefferson Memorial. Mr. Frederick Law Olmsted,
landscape architect, prepared the design, which was presented by Mr. F. Lamond,

of the firm of Olmsted Brothers. Mr. Hubbard called attention to the two features of the scheme---one to provide for planting adjacent to the memorial building, the cost of this planting to be met by the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission; the second plan showing planting outside of the circular driveway around the memorial, this planting to be done by the National Park Service. Mr. Hubbard called attention to the driveways indicated in the plan, the arrangement of which, he said, is still somewhat problematical. Also Mr. Hubbard explained the variety of planting he proposed and of which he submitted memoranda explanatory of the symbols in the plans. Mr. Hubbard withdrew.

Mr. Clarke, as the landscape architect member of the Commission, was asked to speak in behalf of the Commission. He felt that the design was too complicated and that it suggested too many different kinds of plants. Mr. Clarke favored particularly a treatment similar to that of the Lincoln Memorial planting, which consists largely of evergreen planting. The Commission referred the scheme to Mr. Clarke for study and report. The Chairman sent a report to Mr. Newton B. Drury, Director of the National Park Service accordingly.(Exhibit D)

12. TREATMENT OF THE RESERVATIONS FOR THE HAHNEMANN AND WEBSTER STATUES: Mr. Donald Kline submitted a grading plan of the reservations on which the Hahnemann and Webster statues are located, having in view a change in the outline of the reservations, which has become necessary because of the construction of the Scott Circle Underpass. The Commission inspected the design and approved it. (Exhibit E)

13. NEW PUMP HOUSE FOR ROCK CREEK: The National Park Service submitted a set of contract drawings for a new pump house to be constructed in the Rock Creek Parkway adjacent to the new Massachusetts Avenue Bridge. The Commission inspected the drawings and approved them. (Exhibit F)

Commission inspected the drawings and approved them. (Exhibit)

Brook Green Parkway adjacent to the new Massachusetts Avenue Bridge. The
a set of contract drawings for a new pump house to be constructed in the

12. NEW PUMP HOUSE FOR BROOK GREEN: The National Park Service submitted

design and approved it. (Exhibit E)

construction of the Scott Circle fountains. The commission inspected the
outline of the reservations, which has become necessary because of the
Hammerman and Webster statues are located, having in view a change in the
Mr. Donald Kline submitted a grading plan of the reservations on which the

12. TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LANDS FOR PARK PURPOSES [illegible]:

Mr. Newton B. Drury, Director of the National Park Service accordingly.(Exhibit)
scheme to Mr. Clarke for study and report. The Chairman sent a report to

which consists largely of evergreen planting. The Commission referred the
favored particularly a treatment similar to that of the Lincoln Memorial planting.
complicated and that it suggested too many different kinds of plants. Mr. Clarke

to speak in behalf of the Commission. He felt that the design was too

Mr. Clarke, as the landscape architect member of the Commission, was asked

Mr. Hubbard withdrew.

and of which be submitted memoranda explanatory of the symbols in the plans.
problematical. Also Mr. Hubbard explained the variety of planting is proposed
indicated in the plans, the arrangement of which, he said, is still somewhat

National Park Service. Mr. Hubbard called attention to the drawings

the circular driveway around the memorial, this planting to be done by the

Jefferson Memorial Commission; the second plan showing planting outside of

memorial building, the cost of this planting to be met by the Thomas

no features of the scheme---one to provide for planting adjacent to the

f the time of Olmsted Brothers. Mr. Hubbard called attention to the

14. NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART: The secretary reported that invitations had been issued for the dedication of the National Gallery of Art on Monday, March 17, at 9:00 p.m. The members stated they had received their invitations and it was decided to hold a meeting of the Commission here in Washington on that day, convening at 2:00 p.m.

15. CONFERENCE CONCERNING REGISTRATION LAW FOR ARCHITECTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA: In accordance with arrangements made, the Commission had a conference with representatives of the Washington Chapter of the American Institute of Architects concerning the question of strengthening the District of Columbia Law pertaining to the registration of architects. The local chapter welcomed the opportunity as expressed in a letter from the Commission adopted at the meeting on January 23d and sent to Mr. Chatelain. The following were present for the conference:

Mr. Leon Chatelain, President, Washington Chapter, A. I. A.
Mr. F. A. Delano, Chairman, National Capital Park and Planning Commission
Mr. Francis P. Sullivan, architect.
Mr. F. V. Murphy, architect.
Mr. E. Philip Schreier, Chairman of the Examining Board of Architects.
Mr. Irwin S. Porter, Member of the Examining Board of Architects and Chairman of the Chapter Committee to amend the Registration Law.
Mr. Julian E. Berla, Secretary of the Washington Chapter, A. I.A.
Mr. Robert F. Beresford, Member of the Examining Board,
Mr. John H. Scarff, of Baltimore, representing the Maryland State Examining Board,
Mr. C. H. Cogill, representing the Virginia State Examining Board,
Mr. C. J. Massie, engineer and architect, secretary of the Virginia State Examining Board.

As a result of the conference the committee decided to give further study to the question of amendments and to inform the Commission from time to time of progress made. A report of the discussion is attached hereto and is made a part of these Minutes. (Exhibit G)

The Commission adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

The following were present for the conference:

Mr. Leon Chatelain, President, Washington Chapter, A. I. A.
Mr. J. A. Mahoney, Chairman, National Capital Park and Planning Commission
Mr. Frederic A. Walcott, architect
Mr. F. V. Murphy, architect.
Mr. J. Hollis Wagner, Chairman of the Zoning Board of Architects.
Mr. Lewis D. Porter, Member of the Zoning Board of Architects and
Chairman of the Chapter Committee to amend the Registration Law.
Mr. Julian K. Davis, Secretary of the Washington Chapter, A. I. A.
Mr. Robert P. Berkley, Member of the Building Board,
Mr. John M. Ewell, of Baltimore, representing the Maryland State
Planning Board.
Mr. C. H. Cobb, representing the Virginia State Planning Board,
Mr. C. A. Massie, engineer and architect, secretary of the
Virginia State Planning Board.

As a result of the conference the committee decided to give further study to the revision of [illegible] to include the Commission's [illegible] and is made a part of these Minutes. (Exhibit G)

The Commission adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

COPY

March 4, 1941.

Dear Sir:

The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia referred to the Commission of Fine Arts your letter of February 18, together with plans for the design of a proposed marquee at the main entrance to the Union Station.

The Commission carefully considered this matter at their meeting on February 28, and noted that the design is similar to a scheme submitted and disapproved some time ago; likewise, the Commission unanimously disapprove the design submitted with your letter of February 18.

It is to be regretted that, after fully thirty years, it is now proposed to erect an ugly structure in front of one of the most important monumental edifices in the City of Washington,- a structure which would have the effect of cutting off the columns, thus destroying the architectural dignity of a notable building. The question of providing adequate shelter at the Union Station is evidently a most perplexing one and unquestionably a problem which needs to be solved.

While the Commission are entirely in sympathy with the necessity of providing adequate facilities for protecting your patrons from the elements, they are nevertheless convinced that the scheme for the marquee is unsatisfactory. It is suggested, therefore, that you obtain the best professional advice possible to look into and report upon this important problem. In this connection, the Commission would be pleased to discuss the matter with you or with any one whom you may appoint, for the purpose of determining, if possible, a satisfactory solution from both the practical and the aesthetic points of view.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very truly yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

Mr. B. R. Tolson,
Washington Terminal Company,
Washington, D.C.

CC: Mr. H. P. Caemmerer

EXHIBIT A

March 4, 1941.

Dear Sir:

The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia referred to the Commission of Fine Arts your letter of February 18, together with plans for the design of a proposed marquee at the main entrance to the Union Station.

The Commission carefully considered this matter at their meeting on February 28, and noted that the design is similar to a scheme submitted and disapproved some time ago; likewise, the Commission unanimously disapproves the design submitted with your letter of February 18.

It is to be regretted that, after fully thirty years, it is now proposed to erect an ugly structure in front of one of the most important monumental edifices in the City of Washington,- a structure which would have the effect of cutting off the columns, time destroying the architectural dignity of a notable building. The question of providing adequate shelter at the Union Station is evidently a most perplexing one and unquestionably a problem which needs to be solved.

While the Commission are entirely in sympathy with the necessity of providing adequate facilities for protecting waiting patrons from the elements, they are heavily convinced that the scheme for the marquee is unsatisfactory. It is suggested, therefore, that you obtain the best professional advice possible to look into and report upon this important problem. In this connection, the Commission would be pleased to discuss the matter with you or with any one whom you may appoint, for the purpose of determining, if possible, a satisfactory solution from both the practical and the aesthetic points of view.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very truly yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

Mr. B. R. Tolson,
Washington Terminal Company,
Washington, D.C.

CC: Mr. H. P. Gemmerer

EXHIBIT A

C O P Y

March 1, 1941.

Dear Mr. Simon:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on February 28th, approved the design you submitted for the new General Accounting Office Building, to be erected at Fifth and G Streets, Northwest. It is understood that certain suggestions made by the Commission will be studied, more particularly in connection with the design of the main garage entrances to this building.

It is noted that you propose to use brick for the exterior; the Commission would be pleased to have you submit a sample of the brick which you recommend.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Hon. Louis A. Simon,
Supervising Architect,
Public Buildings Administration,
Federal Works Agency,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT B

EXHIBIT B

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Washington
Copy

March 1, 1941.

Dear Mr. Simon:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on February 28th, approved the design you submitted for a Coal Receiving Building in connection with the West Central Heating Plant.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Sgd) Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

Hon. Louis A. Simon,
Supervising Architect,
Public Buildings Administration,
Federal Works Agency,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT C

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
ington
Copy

, 1934.

:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on February 28th, approved the design you submitted for a Coal Receiving Building in connection with the West Central .

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

,

(
.

EXHIBIT C

Washington, D. C.
Federal Works Agency,
Public Buildings ,
Supervising Architect,

C O P Y

March 4, 1941.

Hon. Newton Drury, Director
National Park Service
Interior Department
Washington, D. C.

Dear Director,

At the request of your office, Mr. Henry V. Hubbard, representing Frederick Law Olmsted, Landscape Architect, presented planting plans for the Thomas Jefferson Memorial for consideration by this Commission. The plans were referred to the Chairman, landscape architect member, for review and report.

In passing judgment in matters of this sort, it must be realized that opinions vary widely with respect to the solution of problems of this character, and in this particular case, the writer hesitates to be critical of so eminent a practitioner as Frederick Law Olmsted, whose name appears on the plans as Landscape Architect. However, since the writer must express an opinion based upon his experience in solving problems of a similar monumental character, he does so, with full knowledge that his judgment is open to critical analysis on the part of the planting designer who prepared the plans under consideration.

In the writer's opinion, the entire planting scheme is out of scale with the Memorial, and in detail, much too fussy.

The scheme for the upper terraces (Plan #770 - File #2843 - PPJ) provides for the use of approximately thirty different varieties of plants, a fact which seems to call for simplification. In particular, it would seem desirable to omit the azaleas, small leaved plants, which, while serving as a ground cover, are out of scale in this particular architectural composition. The Juniperus virginiana (red cedar) should be omitted, since these would serve only to repeat the vertical note expressed by the rows of columns; neither may red be associated with the Magnolia grandiflora. Taxus in variety, and other thoroughly satisfactory plants which are used. The red cedars are objected to principally upon the basis of aesthetic relationship with a building having the character of a drum surrounded by columns, the latter needing no further vertical recall in the planting scheme.

The scheme for the areas outside of the Memorial circular drive (Plan #758 - File #2843 - PPJ), contains, in the opinion of the

EXHIBIT D

Washington, D. C.

At the request of your office, Mr. Henry V. Hubbard, re presenting the Frederick Law Olmsted, Landscape Architect, presented plan ning plans for the Thomas Jefferson Memorial for consideration by this Commission. The plans were referred to the Chairman, Landscape Architect member, for review and report.

In passing judgment in matters of this sort, it must be realized that opinions vary widely with respect to the solution of problems of this character, and in this particular case, the writer hesitates [illegible] problems of a similar nature [illegible] of the planting designer who prepared the plans under consideration.

In the writer's opinion, the entire planting scheme is out of scale with the Memorial, and in detail, much too fussy.

The scheme for the upper terraces (Plan #770 - File #8643 - PP3) [illegible] it would seem desirable to [illegible] which, while serving as a ground cover, are out of scale in this particular architectural composition. The Junipers virginiana cedar) should be omitted, since these would serve only to repeat the vertical note expressed by the rows of columns; neither may red be associated with the Magnolia grandiflora. Taxus in variety, and other thoroughly satisfactory plants which are used. The red cedar are objected to principally upon the basis of aesthetic relation- ship with a building having the character of a drum surrounded by columns, the latter needing no tree or vertical result in the plant- ing scheme.

The scheme for the areas outside of the Memorial circular drive (Plan #755 - File #8842 - PP1), contains, in the opinion of the

writer, too many different varieties of plant material, which will result in a scheme too gardenesque, too detailed, and comprising plants too small in character to be in proper scale with the environs. The writer believes that all areas outside of the outer drive should be planted with trees and grass only, including major and minor trees, the latter principally Japanese cherries, in accordance with the express wishes of the President. Trees, in this large scale composition, would serve to create a more permanent treatment, and one in better scale with the Memorial. Limiting the planting of these areas in the manner suggested would appear to create a more quiet and more dignified planting composition, in character with the building and, quite incidentally, make for a much simpler problem of maintenance, an important consideration in a public park where great crowds gather.

In view of the contemplated changes with respect to the re-arrangement of park drives (Plan #204 - File #2843 - PPJ), incident to the construction of the Fourteenth Street and Maine Avenue grade crossing separation structures, the Commission advise that further study be given to the problem of circulation in the vicinity of the Jefferson Memorial, outside of the circular drive, including the two diagonal roads connecting this drive with the present park road passing south of the Memorial. The Commission consider the proposed scheme inadequate, and in character inappropriate.

The whole problem of parking automobiles in the vicinity of the Jefferson Memorial appears to require further study, and in this connection, the Commission would be pleased to discuss this matter with your representatives at such time as may be appropriate in the circumstances.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very truly yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

CC: Mr. H. P. Caemmerer
Mr. Root, Superintendent
National Capital Parks

GDC:FJ

writer, too many different varieties of plant material, which will [illegible]

too small in character to be [illegible] outside of the outer drive should

The writer believes that all areas outside of the outer drive should

the express wishes of the [illegible]

composition, would serve to create a more permanent treatment, and

building and, quite important consideration in a public park where

of maintenance, an important consideration in a public park where

In view of the contemplated changes with respect to the re-

to the construction of the [illegible] Plan 1924 - 1926 - 1931, incident

grade crossing separation structures, the Commission advise that

further study be given to the problem of circulation in the vicinity

of the Jefferson Memorial, outside of the circular drive, including

road passing south of the Memorial.

proposed scheme inadequate, and in character inappropriate.

The whole problem of parking automobiles in the vicinity of the

Jefferson Memorial appears to require further study, and in this

connection, the Commission would be pleased to discuss this matt[illegible]

with your representatives at such time as may be appropriate in the

circumstances.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Chairman.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Washington
Copy

March 1, 1941.

Dear Mr. Drury:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on February 28th, approved the design you submitted for the treatment of the reservations on which the Hahnemann Memorial and the Statue of Daniel Webster are located, in view of the construction of the Scott Circle Underpass.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Sgd) Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

Hon. Newton B. Drury, Director,
National Park Service,
Interior Department,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT E

March 1, 1921.

Dear Mr. Burke:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on February 28th, approved the design you submitted for the treatment of the reservations on which the Hahnemann Memorial and the Statue of Daniel Webster are located, in view of the

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

(Sgd) Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

Washington
D. C.

EXHIBIT E

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Washington
Copy

March 1, 1941.

Dear Mr. Drury:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on February 28th, approved the contract drawings submitted by your office for the Rock Creek Parkway Pump House.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Sgd) Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

Hon. Newton B. Drury, Director,
National Park Service,
Interior Department,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT F

February 28, 1941.

Conference concerning the Registration Law for Architects with representatives of the Washington Chapter, A.I.A., and the Commission of Fine Arts.

Mr. Clarke. It has been suggested that the local registration law for architects be amended. As you know, we have submissions coming every month under the so-called Shipstead-Luce Act, in which wex are asked to approve or to disapprove buildings that are designed in the office of private individuals, builders, or architects. The Shipstead Act concerns the Central Composition of Washington, Rock Creek Park and Parkway; Lafayette Square was added last year. Then we have to advise as to signs and the treatment xxx of buildings in thase areas. On looking at the law for registration of architects in the City of Washington or the District of Columbia we are all of the opinion that it does not have sufficient teeth in it to result in our getting the kind of submissions we would like to have. You all know, as we do, that you do not have to be a trained architect to prepare plans for buildings to submit them to the Building Inspector's office or to this Commission and we may have very naively suggested to you that this law might be amended so as to be comparable to the laws of Pennsylvania, New York, Ohio, Illinois, or Connecticut. While we are not in a position to take the initiative in the matter I am sure we would be very glad to help. I know Mr. Delano and his Commission will be glad to help in any way they can in order to strengthen your hands in attempting to have the professions of architecture represented as I hope you think it should be in the District of Columbia, so that it will be more difficult, if not impossible, for people who are not trained architects to erect buildings in the District of Columbia. That is about all I can state at the present time. I wrote to the President of your Chapter and suggested it might be worth discussing it briefly to see what measures might be taken to amend the law in such a way that would make for better buildings in the District of Columbia. We are glad to entertain discussion on the part of any one of you. Mr. Delano might supplement my statement because the experience of the Park and Planning Commission is somewhat like our own.

Mr. Delano. This is a subject I have given a good deal of time to and I think my chief qualification for discussion of it is my great age and therefore my experience. I suppose you all know I have gotten to the ripe age where I am in my 78th year and I have been interested a good deal in city planning since the subject first became an important subject some 35 years ago. I am hot and bothered about a lot of things that have happened, particularly about the Zoning Act. I have always hated the word and always hated the procedure. It has always been slow and just a few steps behind in a critical time. I would rather see some kind of law where the leadership would be in front rather than punitive behind. Yet I have to take my hats off to Bettman xxx of Cincinnati and Bassett of New York, and others, who have made what I call an unpopular subject fairly popular and fairly well known. Yet I do know there are a lot of architects, because they are working for their clients, who find it necessary when the Zoning Law forbids their adding certain things of discovering an ingenious way of meeting the technicality of the law but beating the spirit of it. I have to meet before a group of people inside of a week on that subject and as I am always in danger of being misquoted I have prepared my statement in advance. But this time I am talking before a group of friends and I have not prepared anything. There are a good many angles to this question. I think for instance all of the professions are up against a very hard situation that is going on. It is going

EXHIBIT G

on all over America and presumably it is going on all over the world, and whoever wins the war it is going to be worse ten years from now than it is today. I refer to the fact that doctors and every honored profession see signs of what they call their profession being commercialized. They see doctors put to a salary for doctoring just like I was going to say a barber; President Eliot used to say the first doctors were barbers and then they got to be doctors. And then the architects, painters, sculptors, they all of them find more and more that they are put on a commercial basis, men paid a salary; engineers and architects will be in the same office. I think engineers are a little outside of the architectural profession but a good many of them will not admit it. Yet I think an architect can help the engineer profitably. I don't know whether you have seen a booklet showing the engineering profession on the T. V. A. and see what good architecture has been able to do with just an artistic touch that greatly improved the engineering features of the power dams without adding greatly to the cost and the engineers are very glad to accept that as a good improvement.

There has been an enormous improvement in my time. When they thought the way to build a bridge was a drab truss bridge and when it was thought a suspension bridge was really a very dangerous thing because it was thought difficult to figure the stress all that has changed so that now it is much easier to figure the stress of spans than for a truss bridge. They found a way to figure the strains and build the suspension bridge without difficulty. When a few months ago a suspension bridge showed weakness that was because of bad design.

When Louis Howe was the President's secretary and when Admiral Peoples was in charge of the Procurement Division a good many things happened in rapid succession. I wrote to Louis Howe about what they were doing. I thought it unfair to the architect. Later Charles Butler, secretary of your Chapter, wrote to me and at his request I wrote to Howe---that was in 1934. Finally I accomplished something with the Secretary of the Treasury at a meeting we had. It was pointed out that the Government ought not to do all of the building by architects hired by the month. I wanted them to consider leaders of the profession. I don't know whether I accomplished anything. I got some lip service. I am ready to help on anything suggested or agreed to by this group. I know I can trust them to do a good job. But I am going back to my thesis that all of the professions are more or less on the spot. There are men who go so far as to say that the only way the professions can protect themselves is to adopt the methods of the labor unions. Well I am frank to say I would be sorry to see them do that.

Mr. Clarke. Thank you Mr. Delano. With respect to the Registration Law,-- I would like to hear from your gentlemen. You know more about it than we do, but it did seem to us that the District of Columbia should have as good a law as exists in some of the States.

Mr. Chatelain. We came today merely to have a discussion and to talk it over with you. Mr. Porter and some of the other members of the Institute are here and we thought it would be a good idea to invite members of the Board of

on all over America and presumably it is going on all over the world, and wherever wins the war it is going to be worse for people from now on than it is today. I refer to the fact that doctors who every measure professing see signs of what they call their profession being commercialized. They too doctors put to a salary for entering just like I was going to say a lawyer; President Hillot used to say the first doctors were barbers and then they got to be doctors. And then the specialists, pediatrics, specialists, they all of them find more and more that they are put on a commercial basis, men pair a salary; engineers and architects will be in the same office. I think engineers were a little outside of the architectural profession but a good many of them will not admit it. Yet I think an architect can help the engineer profitably. I don't know whether you have seen a booklet showing the engineering progression on the T. V. A. and see what good architecture has been able to do with just an artistic touch that greatly improved the engineering features of the power dams without adding greatly to the cost and the engineers are very glad to accept that as a good improvement.

There has been an enormous improvement in my time. When they brought the way to build a bridge was a dark brown bridge and then it was thought a suspension bridge was really a very daring piece of work although it was difficult to figure the stress all that has changed so that now it is even easier to figure the stress of spans than for a truss bridge. They found a way to figure the strains and build the suspension bridge without difficulty. When a few months ago a suspension bridge showed weakness that was because of bad design.

When Louis Howe was the President's secretary and when Admiral Peoples was in charge of the Procurement Division a good many bridges happened in rapid succession. I wrote to Louis Howe about what they were doing. I thought it unfair to the architect. Later Charles Butler, secretary of Port Chester, wrote to me and at his request I wrote to Howe---that was in 1926. Finally I accomplished something with the Secretary of the Treasury as a meeting we had. It was pointed out that the Government ought not to do all of the building by architects hired by the month. I wanted them to consider leaders of the profession. I don't know whether I accomplished anything. I put some zip service. I am ready to help on anything suggested or agreed to by this group. I know I can trust them to do a good job. But I am going back to my thesis that all of the professions are more or less on the spot. There are men who go so far as to say that the only way the profession can protect themselves is to accept the methods of the labor unions. Well I am frank to say I would be sorry to see them do that.

Mr. Clarke. Thank you Mr. Nelson. With respect to the registration law--- I would like to hear from your gentlemen. You know more about it than we do, but it did seem to us that the District of Columbia should have as good a law as exists in some of the States.

Mr. Chatelain. We came today merely to have a discussion and to talk it over with you. Mr. Porter and some of the other members of the Institute are here and we thought it would be a good idea to invite members of the Board of

Architects from Virginia and Maryland, since our Washington men have clients in the adjoining counties. Virginia and Maryland do have a better laws than Washington, and the local chapter has for quite a few years been trying to get a better registration law, and our Registration Board feels the same way about it. I believe we have a majority of the members of that Board present. Likewise we have suggested to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia that something be done. Now I would like to call on Mr. Porter, a member of the Registration Board.

Mr. Porter. The history of the Registration Law in the District of Columbia is a pretty poor one. The chapter for a good many years has tried a number of times to strengthen the Registration Law, but as we have gone along we have always had the opposition of real estate men, and real estate men have always referred us to the Board of Trade and civic organizations and many of their members have been against us. So we have tried to think of other ways. I am a member of the Registration Board and have talked this matter over with the members a number of times. Only the last meeting I brought up the subject to see what we could do about it. Back in 1933 the Board advised the Commissioners that the law was not what it ought to be and that it should be changed; it was quite a lengthy report. We have gone along that way and we have tried to work out some way whereby we could get together, get the facts as we say, keep it quiet from the real estate men, and attempt to have the law strengthened. It is rather an interesting thing to note an improvement in that real estate men are now employing registered architects quite frequently; that was not true a few years ago. We have Mr. Heaton and Mr. Chatelain on a strong Committee on the Board of Trade and we hope nothing will be said in public before we get the support of that Committee. Last year representatives of the Washington Board met with the Baltimore Board. There were a number of violations of a District of Columbia man who was a designer that practiced in Maryland and Virginia and they wanted to know whether or not our law could be strengthened, and I think as a result of that meeting this meeting has developed, because we were pleased to get your letter, Mr. Clarke; we were glad to know that the Commission of Fine Arts feels as we do. Now our Committee had a number of meetings. Mr. Schreier is Chairman of the Registration Board of the District. We have about reached certain conclusions but we have not yet reported to the Washington Chapter for fear it might get out. We have studied the law of other States to determine whether it would be a proper law to pattern after it.

The law of Pennsylvania is a good law and where it has been tested in the courts and its weakness has been found in recent years they have adopted legislation to correct it. We have not gone so far as that but we have about reached certain conclusions. That is as far as we have gone and we are only too glad to try to strengthen the District of Columbia law.

Mr. Clarke. We were not certain whether any former architect members of the Commission reviewed the law when it was drafted, but I can say this Commission

Mr. Porter. The history of the Registration Law in the District of Columbia is a pretty poor one. The chapter for a good many years has tried a number of times to strengthen the Registration Law, but as we have gone along we have always returned to the point of fraud and civic organizations and many of their members have been against us. So we have tried to take care of other ways. I am a member of the Registration Board and have talked this matter over with the members a number of times. Only the last meeting I brought up the subject to see what we could do about it. That is just the Board advised the Commissioners that the Law was not worth it ought to be and that it should be changed; it was quite a lengthy report. We have gone along that way and we have tried to work out some way whereby we could get together, get the facts as we say, keep it quiet from the real estate men, and attempt to have the law strengthened. It is rather an interesting thing to note an improvement in that real estate men are now employing registered architects quite frequently; that was not true a few years ago. We have Mr. Benson and Mr. Chatelain on a strong Committee on the Board of Trade and we hope nothing will be said in public before we get the support of that Committee. Next year's representatives of the Building Board met with the Baltimore Board. There were a number of violations of a District of Columbia man who was a designer that practiced in Maryland and Virginia and they wanted to know whether or not our law could be strengthened, and I think as a result of that meeting this meeting was developed, because we were pleased to get your letter, Mr. Chairman; we were glad to know that the Commission of Fine Arts feels as we do. Now our Committee had a number of meetings. Mr. Bowditch is Chairman of the Registration Board of the District. We have about reached certain conclusions but we have not yet reported to the Washington Chapter for fear it might get out. We have studied the law of other States to determine whether it would be a proper law to pattern after it.

The law of Pennsylvania is a good law and where it has been tested in the courts and its weakness has been found in recent years they have adopted legislation to correct it. We have not gone so far as that but we have about reached certain conclusions. What is as far as we have gone and we are only too glad to try to strengthen the District of Columbia law.

Mr. Olmsted. We were not certain whether any former architect members of the Commission reviewed the law when it was drafted, but I can say this Commission

is unified on the opinion that the law is not as good as it should be.

Mr. Schreier. It is important to keep in mind that in the past when efforts have been made to change the architect's registration law they have of necessity been promoted by the architects. In this matter there are two important factors that oppose it. One, it is obviously selfish interests and the other Congressional influence which would prevent us from getting favorable action on new legislation. But even if we could get the support of Members of Congress we would still be open to criticism from purely selfish interests unless we can have the support of the Fine Arts Commission, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and bodies of adjoining States as concurring with us in our opinion that we should have an improved registration law. You said we should have a law that is as good as that of some States. I say we should have a law not only as good as others but a model law for the Nation.

Mr. Clarke. I think all that is necessary for Mr. Delano or the Commission of Fine Arts to do is to write the proper letter to bring the matter to the attention of the Library Committee or other appropriate Committee of Congress, since it is one that involves the entire District of Columbia and the appearance of Washington. We are not interested, and we can readily say it, in the architects. We are interested in better buildings, particularly better private buildings built by private interests that come under the jurisdiction of the Commission of Fine Arts. I think I can speak for Mr. Delano when I say we would be glad to help.

Mr. Delano said that he thought "our appearance would be worth more than a letter." Mr. Clarke replied, "I would be glad to represent the Commission of Fine Arts." Continuing, Mr. Delano said, "I think, better than law, the time is going to come when it is just as important to know that a new building is not offensive on a street as it is to know that it is fireproof. I think we must come to that as an objective. Now just how we are going to bring that about is hard to say, but it is important and should have supervision just as we have an office that has charge of "space control". We cannot let one speculator or one owner spoil a section of the city in which he lives even though technically ~~it~~ he is not violating a Zoning Law. I find a good many real estate men that are sympathetic, some are not. The trouble is the Zoning Law does not go far enough. The Zoning Commission simply advises as to plans involving questions of height, mass and use. It is not concerned with the appearance of a building.

Mr. Schreier remarked, "That calls attention to a scheme that was established by the Washington Chapter back 10 or 15 years ago. The Chapter organized a Council for the review of plans which were submitted for permits at the District Building. Now it was rather late to consider plans then, but we had no access to the plans, and at considerable sacrifice to the Chapter a number of architects were enrolled for periods of a week or two weeks to go to the District Building to pass on plans in the Building Inspector's office. We had no official status, but we had an opportunity to see things that the Fine Arts Commission would never see. The fact that we had no official status made it more or less a lost cause. We were without strength to enforce the recommendations; they either made the changes or didn't. The Council went so far as to give an award of merit for good plans, but when it became a "Board of Education" for training and improving the ability of an architect to bring about an improvement in design that spoiled the effectivenss of the Council. We

say we would be glad to help.

Mr. Delano said that he thought "our arguments would be worth more than a letter." Mr. Clarke replied, "I would be glad to represent the Commission of Fine Arts." Continuing, Mr. Delano said, "I think better than building is not ordering so a street as it is to know that it is there[illegible]. I think we must come to that as an objective." Now just how we are going to [illegible] that is hard to say, but it is important and should have immediate [illegible] we have an office that can charge of "Space control". He cannot let one speculator or one owner spoil a design of the city in which he lives even though [illegible] be in not violation a zoning law. I find a good many well [illegible] men that are synthetic, and are not. The trouble is the zoning law does not go far enough. The zoning commission simply advises on the plans [illegible] of height, mass and use. It is not concerned with the appearance of a building.

Mr. Bartholomew remarked, that until action to a scheme that was established by the zoning commission there back in 1920's. The chamber organized a Council for the review of plans which was instituted for permits at the Interior Building. Now it was rather late to consider plans then, but we had no access to the plans, and it considerable sacrifice to the height of a number of architects were enrolled for periods of a week or two each to the Interior Building to pass on plans in the building inspector's office. We had no official access, but we had an opportunity to see things that the Fine Arts Commission would never see. The fact that we had no official status made it more or less a joke sometimes. We were without the recommendations; they either were the changes or didn't. The Council was to [illegible] to give an advice if asked for good plans, but when it became a "Board of Supervision" for treating and ignoring the ability of an architect to [illegible] about an improvement it destroyed the efficiency of the Council. We

were helping incompetence in an architect and attempting to make a design for him. However, I think it is still an excellent idea and should we get a good registration law, the Council could be set up for reviewing plans, to correct the evils that Mr. Delano has pointed out, namely that while plans may not be in violation of the Zoning Law they may violate good taste and or good judgment and be offensive to the neighborhood; if then the Council could have some strength we could be assured of better plans.

Mr. Beresford. The Registration Law of the District of Columbia has failed for a long time. The possible considerations to improve the Registration Law should not be based on the idea of protecting the architect or of benefiting any one individually. The only way we could justify it is on the basis of protection of the public from poorly planned buildings, poorly planned and designed and constructed by men who were not properly trained; I think this is a point we ought not to overlook---that this is not a matter for the protection of the architect but rather for the protection of the public. What happened last year both in the Maryland Board and the Virginia Board shows there is reason for trying to improve conditions.

Mr. Scarf (representing the Maryland Board). The Board is constantly operating in relation to the public and we members emphasize the point that the law is for the protection of the public and not to protect the profession. In Maryland anyone to practice architecture or to use the term architect must be properly qualified. In the District of Columbia a man avoids the use of the word architect and he can still design buildings, so that a great many men make drawings that refrain from using the word architect; they make designs and there is nothing we can do about it. So we would be very much gratified if the District of Columbia law could be very much more strengthened to conform to the Maryland law. The Maryland law does give the right of reciprocity to the engineer.

Mr. Lamb said, "They do that in New York;in case of a man who is not a registered architect he can submit his plans through a registered architect who is in his employ, but I don't think many registered architects would sign their names to a set of drawings for which they are responsible."

Mr. Scarf. Our Maryland law is the same as the Virginia law in that respect, and we would now be pleased if the District of Columbia would go a little further so as to give us a chance to improve our law. The last time our law was amended was three years ago.

Mr. Sullivan. There could have been no particularly strong amendments made to the law, but I think it would be worth consideration now to do better. I think the Park and Planning Commission and the Fine Arts Commission and the State Boards should aim to appeal to Congressmen and I am very happy to learn of the interest of the Fine Arts Commission in this matter and hope it can be adopted.

Mr. Murphy. I think a good deal of our trouble starts with what is meant by architecture. Vitruvius said an architect is one who designs for beauty, stability and durability. Now we have to consider questions of cost and

were helping inconvenience in an organized and attempting to make a battle for him. However, I think it is still an excellent law and ought we get a good registration law. The Council could be set up for metering plans, to correct the evils that do. Perhaps they pointed out, merely that while plans or good judgment and be otherwise to the neighborhood; it even the Council could have some strength we could be assured of better plans.

Mr. Hartford. The Registration Law of the District of Columbia has failed for a long time. The possible combinations to improve the Registration Law should not be based on the idea of protecting the architect or of benefiting any one individually. The only way we could justify it is on the basis of protection of the public from poorly planned buildings, poorly planned and designed and constructed by men who were not properly trained; I think this is a point we ought not to overlook--that this is not a matter for the protection of the architect but rather for the protection of the public. That happened last year both in the Maryland Court and the Virginia Court where is person for trying to improve architecture.

Mr. Ecker (reassuming the chair). The Board is concerned operating in relation to the public and we wonder sometimes the point that the law is for the protection of the public and not to protect the profession. In Maryland anyone to practice architecture or to use the term architect must be properly qualified. In the District of Columbia a man avoids the use of the word architect and he can still design buildings, so that a great many make drawings that result from using the word architect. They make drawings and there is nothing we can do about it. So we would be very much gratified if the Register of Columbia law could be very much more strengthened to conform to the Maryland law. The Maryland law does give the right of responsibility to the engineer.

Mr. Lamb said, "They do that in New York; in case of a man who is not a registered architect he can submit his plans through a registered architect who is in his employ, but I don't think any registered architects would sign their names to a set of drawings for which they are responsible."

Mr. Ecker. Our Maryland law is the same as the Virginia law in that respect, and we would now be pleased if the Register of Columbia would go a little further so as to give us a change to improve our law. The last time our law was amended was three years ago.

Mr. Mullive. There could have been no particularly strong opposition made to the law, but I think it would be worth consideration now to do that. I think the Fine Arts Planning, Commission and the Fine Arts Commission and the Zoning Boards should aid to appeal to Congressman and I am very happy to learn of the interest of the Fine Arts Commission in this matter and hope it can be adopted.

Mr. Murphy. I think a good deal of our trouble starts with what is meant by architecture. Plumbing said an architect is one who designs for beauty, stability and durability. Does we have to consider questions of cost and

many other things, so no one knows what an architect is. Some buildings are so built so that what we call design might be an engineering project. On the other hand an architect might be useful in that field. I think the real trouble is in architectural schools and institutes and registration laws where the word architect should be defined and then his practice should be controlled accordingly. I met a dentist who some time later called himself an orthodontist and then a periodontist. Some architects become really something other than architects. Some of the men have become marvelous engineers; we have two here. So I think the trouble starts with that. It is hard to adopt a registration law to control the profession in the line of work that is not clearly defined. We let the men design and sometimes they do quite well without an architect and you think he is going to be one. I think the steps we have taken are in the right direction.

Mr. Berla. I would like to ask what is the next step. It appears that there is a unanimity of opinion. We are pleased to have had that letter from the Commission. Now you and Mr. Delano and the gentlemen from Virginia and Maryland can give us concrete help in stating what we should do. You know we have to carry the burden and do the real work. We have to do it. Now I would like to know what is the next step.

Mr. Porter. Last summer when we had the meeting of representatives from the District, Maryland and Virginia, to consider the question of registration, I left the meeting with the feeling that the Washington Chapter was going to define the word architect and to suggest to the Maryland and Virginia Boards what sort of a law they want. Now it seems the word should come from the Maryland and Virginia Boards in cooperation with the local chapter. The pressure could come from Maryland and Virginia Congressmen that the District of Columbia law is weak. That is what we have been working for and I think that is the way we would like to work it out.

Mr. Scarf said the Maryland Board will do whatever is thought proper to do.

Mr. Clarke. I think if we could get a sympathetic ear from a Representative in Virginia or Maryland to start this going and obtain his advice as to the appropriate Committee of the House or Senate to consider the matter, this Commission would be glad to take it up with the Chairman of the Committee any time and appear at a Hearing. Of course you know they are busy on the Hill and the question of changing the law will not loom up as very important in relation to problems of National Defense. Nevertheless I think the matter can be placed before the proper Committee on the Hill and, coming from the outside, it is certain to receive attention. We can emphasize the mushroom building that is going on in the District; that is the reason for wanting the change in the law and tie it up with the National Defense program if possible. I would be glad to come down here, unless I can get one of the architect members to do it, to represent our case, aimed to uphold standards in building design in the District of Columbia.

Mr. C. J. Massie, engineer, and secretary of the Virginia Board, spoke of the overlapping of the professions of architecture and engineering

Now I would like to know what is the next step.

in the design of buildings; some are primarily engineering projects, and in others architecture predominates. His suggestion was to have a joint board, but this was not deemed feasible. Mr. Massie felt improvements might be made in the Shipstead-Luce Act

Mr. Clarke. We had a discussion this morning about improving the Shipstead-Luce Act and we invited Mr. Settle, Secretary of the Park and Planning Commission. The Planning Commission by law initiates amendments to the Shipstead Act. We have also discussed this problem together at joint meetings for years. There has been agitation in Washington recently to extend the Shipstead-Luce Act. I have been giving the matter thought ever since I have been on the Commission. I have always expressed the personal opinion that we should go slowly for fear if we go too fast the courts would not understand and we might run the chance of losing the whole thing, because when we bring into the courts the problems of taste it is difficult to measure. Therefore this morning I think we had a meeting of the minds in the Commission that we would not see any objection to enlarging the Act in certain areas in the vicinity of public buildings or public lands, such as Dupont Circle, or some other park areas. However to control areas adjacent to quasi-public buildings, as churches or embassies, we are not in favor of that. Some of us felt it would be difficult, at least at this time, to have the Shipstead-Luce Act extended beyond the areas where buildings do not front upon Government property. I think some of us expressed the idea when the Act is expanded beyond Government property then it might expand over the whole city. Some might want a church built in 1895 protected and others would not care and perhaps would rather see the church torn down, and when you get the lawyers involved in trying to express their opinions on matters of artistic taste, no one knows where a thing of that kind is going to end. So we are inclined to be a little cautious in the matter, and the last thing I would want to see is to have the matter come into the courts and declare the Act unconstitutional. It seems to me the time will come when the public will be educated to it and the law will apply to the entire District of Columbia. But I don't see how seven members can express a uniform opinion on questions of architecture, so I don't see how we can very well pass opinion for the whole city.

Mr. Delano. The need that stimulated the effort to extend the Shipstead-Luce Act was poor design in buildings. There have already been one or two amendments. For a long time Lafayette Park was to be included, but private owners felt they could get more money to come up to 110'. Fortunately death took care of some of the tenants and I got busy and got Lafayette Park included in the area covered by the Act. Now everyone knows sometimes you have to seize an opportunity. The opportunity presented itself this summer when that outrageous building was proposed on Connecticut Avenue and Rhode Island Avenue. It complied with the Zoning Regulations. The building permit had already been issued and I was called upon to stop the building. I tried everything to stop it,but I said at least we must not allow such a thing again. In that case there was a cathedral nearby and in the opinion of some perhaps not very beautiful but one for which people had affection; and in the same block was another church building, Presbyterian. Not always do you get the Presbyterians

might be made in the Shipstead-Luce Act

and the Catholics in the same block and I don't belong to either, but having failed in that I decided to help. It is not a mandatory law, and if the law had applied to the building, this Commission would have been compelled to decide not in a mandatory way but to say that the building as designed should not be built. The design is not sufficient to justify a twelve story building; the Commission could have taken that position. All I am asking for is to concur with the Chairman that we must proceed cautiously. I think we must realize the tremendous field of vested interests . In getting this law before Congress you must have the support of the architects, the engineers and the lawyers, and you should find out what the real estate board will do. I believe in protecting the professions. I think you as architects are entitled to be treated as well as plumbers and masons.

In conclusion the Chairman said, "Unless you have something more to say we can adjourn". Mr. Chatelain replied that they would formulate their plans and keep in touch with the Commission concerning the matter.

and the Commission in the same light as I don't belong to either, but having failed in that I decided to help. It is not a mandatory law, and if the law had applied to this building, this committee would have been compelled to decide not in a mandatory way but to say that the building as designed should not be built. The design is not sufficient to justify a twelve story building; the Commission could have taken that position. All I am asking for is to concur with the Chairman that we must proceed cautiously. I think we must realize the tremendous field of vested interests. In getting this law before Congress you must have the support of the architects, the engineers and the lawyers, and you should find out what the real estate board will do. I believe in protecting the professions. I think you as architects are entitled to be treated as well as planners and masons.

In conclusion the Chairman said, "Unless you have something more to say we can adjourn". Mr. Charleia replied that they would formulate their plans and keep in touch with the Commission concerning the matter.

Thirteenth Report of the Commission of Fine Arts

The thirteenth report of the Commission of Fine Arts, transmitted by its Chairman, Gilmore D. Clarke, to the President of the United States, covering a period of five years from January 1, 1935, until Devember 31, 1939, is an important document. The origin of the Commission is described in a letter from the late Elihu Root, dated April 22, 1935, recalling that the Congressional Committee on the Library found itself confronted with a proposal for the Government to purchase a probably worthless art collection and so thought that an official art commission could pass on such matters. The bill drawn by Mr. Root passed Congress and was approved May 17, 1910. Mr. Root commented: "If the bill had undertaken to give any compulsory effect to the opinion of the Commission, it would not have passed... And so, without creation of any power of legal compulsion, there was brought to the service of the Government the authority of competent opinion upon questions of art arising in the course of administration, and widespread and habitual deference to such an opinion has saved the Government and the community from God knows how many atrocities."

We find in the Report the early history of the preparation of the L'Enfant Plan, an account of the mistakes resulting from the neglected years of the 19 C, and the story of the revival of the plan by the McMillan Commission's Report of 1901. Plans for a creditable list of the new public buildings and extensions have been approved, also the site and plans for the Washington National Airport. Plans for a goodly number of statues, monuments and memorials have been studied and reported on. The controversial Jefferson Memorial is now being erected on a site on the south side of the Tidal Basin which was selected "with the advice and approval of the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission," but, according to the Report, "the design submitted was disapproved by the Commission of Fine Arts. Nevertheless, the Commission offered constructive criticism in connection with details of the architectural design." The Commission has approved the design of Paul Cret for the Peace Monument at Gettysburg and the plans of the National Park Service for improving the grounds around the Statue of Liberty in New York harbor.

The five years witnessed an unprecedented number of murals on the walls of the new public buildings. Reference is made, too, to the opinion of Gilmore D. Clarke, Chairman of the Commission, expressed in reply to a letter of inquiry from the American Planning and Civic Association, concerning the use of The Blue Boy on billboards. He condemned the practice of using famous paintings on sign boards.

The Commission of Fine Arts has passed on many plans for private structures facing public buildings and grounds, as provided in the Shipstead-Luce Act of 1930, and the Report comments: "While the law is unique among laws of the country pertaining to the control of private buildings, it is to be remembered that control of the height of private buildings in the City of Washington was originally provided for under regulations approved by President Washington on October 17, 1791." Washington and Jefferson looked forward to a city of 800,000, a population which is being approached in the 1940 census.

The Commission reports progress on the Municipal Center and other District of Columbia projects, including a new steel girder bridge to replace the old Chain Bridge, the new Massachusetts Avenue stone arch to replace the old fill, and the Pennsylvania Avenue bridge crossing the Anacostia. Plans for various school buildings and a new public library located in the Municipal Center have been approved. The Report presents a letter of inquiry from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia concerning the application of a billboard company for new locations in the District, explaining that it had been against the policy of the District to grant new locations and that none had been permitted in a good many years. The Commission of Fine Arts urged that no more locations be granted, even in commercial and industrial districts. They were unanimously opposed to the erection of billboards in the city of Washington. The Commissioners agreed with Mr. Charles A. Coolidge, a member of the Commission, that it should be possible for us to have the Capital of our Nation a city "where beauty is not destroyed by commercial advertising."

The Commission has paid special attention to the landscape protection and treatment of parks and open spaces. The Mall development has proceeded under its watchful eye.

Altogether this is an admirable report of a Commission which has performed a valuable service for the Federal City and without which Washington would fall far short of the beauty it has achieved today, though we all admit that there is room for further improvement.

Defense Housing Exhibit

A traveling exhibit which makes a plea for good housing in the defense emergency has already been sent to fifteen cities. It was a volunteer contribution, made in spare time, by a number of young architects of the Washington Chapter of the A. I. A. The contributors were: Howard Armstrong, Harold Boutin, Christopher Chamales, George Cronin, Branch Elam, Alston Gutterson, Norman Hansen, William Haussman, William Suite, Lewis Stevens, Cloethiel Woodard and David Yerkes.

Pictures, drawings and charts illustrate the general theme that defense housing must be properly integrated with the community of which it is a part. Good housing makes for healthy people, who are important for defense and national well being.